<center>REMARKS</center>

These remarks are set forth in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 22, 2006 (the "Office Action"). As this amendment has been timely filed with the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 19 are pending in the Patent Application. In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,058,416 to Mukherjee et al. (Mukherjee). Additionally, the Examiner has rejected each of claims 1 through 5, 7 through 12 and 14 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,008,853 to Bly et al. (Bly) in view of United States Patent No.6,901,448 to Zhu et al. (Zhu). Also, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bly in view of Zhu and the Official Notice taken for the use of an Enterprise Java Bean (EJB) to facilitate the transfer of information.

In response, the Applicants have carefully considered the cited portions of Mukherjee, Bly and Zhu, and the Official Notice taken by the Examiner and respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections on the art in that key elements of the independent claims are lacking in all of the cited references. Prior to further addressing the rejections on the art, a brief review of the Applicants' invention is appropriate. The Applicants have invented a method and system for the establishment of a named collaborative space (referred to herein as "NCS") in a collaborative computing environment.

The NCS of the Applicants' invention provides a templatable and provisionable approach to facilitate the deployment of collaborative computing environments and places. Templatable as used herein refers to the ability of a collaborative computing community developer or user to create an NCS which can serve as a model for other named spaces. Provisionable as used herein

refers to the ability of a collaborative computing community developer or user to base an NCS on a previous named space in a manner which may require little or no customization. Thus, deploying subsequent named spaces using the method and system of the Applicants' invention involves merely calling up an existing template and arranging it to fit the needs of the community.

Claims 1 and 8 as amended previously recite a collaborative computing method for the establishment of a named collaborative space. The claimed method as amended includes four limitation:

(A)   providing a named collaborative space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and configured to manage **a plurality of business process components** disposed within the named space **in a one-to-many relationship**;

(B)   identifying a membership set for the named collaborative space, the membership set including one or more members;

(C)   providing a plurality of business process component instances for management within the named collaborative space; and,

(D)   managing a common lifecycle for each of the named collaborative space and the business process components within the named collaborative space.

Turning now to the rejections on the art, Mukherjee relates to a system, method and computer program storage device providing event and state sharing support for building object-oriented interactive groupware in wide-area distributed environments such as the Internet. As a part of the description of an inventive embodiment in Mukherjee, an implementation relative to collaborative applications programmed using events is discussed as well in which mechanisms

are provided for sharing application-specific events. Importantly, as stated in column 4, lines 58-67,

> The server 120 (either a client machine can be used to run the server 120, or a dedicated server machine can be used) maintains a set of collaborative activities 150 (described in more detail in FIG. 2), **one for each active collaboration**. The server 120 identifies clients in a collaboration, for example, using their Internet addresses. The server 120 may maintain relevant information about a client such as geographical location (used for efficient multicast protocols), the number of connections to the server 120 and the collaborations that a client 100,170 is participating in.

Thus, Mukherjee fails to provide the Applicants' claimed limitation, "providing a named collaborative space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and configured to manage a plurality of business process components disposed within the named space in a one-to-many relationship".

The cited portions of Bly, namely Figures 3, 9 and column 20, lines 1-15 (collectively the "Bly cited portions"), unlike the cited portions of Mukherjee, do not relate to an operational logic, application component and especially not a business process component. Rather, the Bly cited portions relate to a "Shared Book". As stated plainly in column 16, lines 16-18, "a shared book 40 is a container that has a plurality of related structured **data** objects which are called entries." In column 18, lines 13-14, Bly continues, "Shared book 40 resides in a particular subdirectory on a particular file service, such as file server 16." Thus, the Examiner has inappropriately equated a "Shared Book" to a "named collaborative space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and configured to manage a plurality of **business process components** disposed within the named space in a one-to-many relationship" as explicitly claimed by the Applicants.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of all rejections based upon Mukherjee under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and Bly and Zhu under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) owing to the foregoing remarks. Thus, this entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner

call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject

application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2006

_____

Steven M. Greenberg
Reg. No.: 44,725
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
1300 Corporate Center Way
Wellington, Florida 33414
Customer No. 46321
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062